

How to map a pseudogap?

A pseudogap (PG) is believed to be responsible for the non Fermi-liquid normal state of cuprate superconductors. In particular, field induced PG collapse causes negative longitudinal magnetoresistance (MR) [1]. The PG collapses because of spin-splitting of the polaron band while the orbital effects are irrelevant [1]. Recently these conclusions, including the Zeeman relation, $k_B T^* = g B_{pg}$, which couples the PG temperature, T^* , and the PG closing field, B_{pg} , were reaffirmed by the authors of Ref.[2]. It will be demonstrated below that [2] lacks consistency and its conclusions are based on fallacious propositions and unsupported by the authors' own experimental results. For these reasons, [2] does not represent reliable independent evidence in support of the original findings by [1].

Unlike [1], Ref.[2] mistakenly assumes that it is not the conductance but the net resistance, $\rho_c = \rho^n + \Delta\rho_c$, that is the sum of two channels: the 'ungapped' $\rho^n \propto T$, measured with intrinsic tunnelling at the highest overheating [3], and $\Delta\rho_c$, the excess resistivity due to DOS depletion [4] obtained by the subtraction of that poorly defined ρ^n from the net $\rho_c(T, B)$. Ref.[2] further claims that $\Delta\rho_c(B)$ extrapolation beyond 60 T gives a reliable B_{pg} -estimate that is insensitive to the functional form of the fit, so that other approximations give the same estimates. I will show below that, in addition to the inconsistency [4] and the lack of theoretical support, the entirely empirical B_{pg} evaluation procedure of [2] lacks both reliability and accuracy.

Providing the data from [2] are reliable, these should allow for a cross-check of the authors' conclusions. However, even a brief look at the insert to Fig.1c reveals several inconsistencies. First, contrary to [2], the power-law fit here appears to be a 3rd order polynomial. Second, unlike [2], which claims $B_{pg} = 300 \pm 50T$, I found that extrapolations of data-compatible fits give B_{pg} in the range 200- ∞ for the same crystal, UD($T_c=90K$). Thus, the accuracy claimed by [2] is seriously overestimated.

Moreover, the data of the most overdoped sample, central to [2], are even more dubious. Let us consider the insert to Fig.2 from [2] (reproduced in Fig.1) which allegedly justifies both the power-law dependence, $\Delta\rho_c(B) - \Delta\rho_c(0) \propto B^\alpha$, and the accuracy of B_{pg} estimate. As is clear from Fig.1, the experimental curves favour an exponential dependence (solid lines) that provides a reasonable T-dependent parameter B_0 (see Table in Fig.1) in drastic contrast to the unphysical scatter of α and $\Delta\rho_c(0)$, the parameters of the fit by [2]. Importantly, Fig.1 suggests a dramatically higher uncertainty

in the extrapolation procedure by [2]. Even if this procedure is adequate, a realistic B_{pg} estimate from Fig.1 gives 100-1000T rather than 86-89 as in [2]. Thus, the experimental data of [2] do not support their conclusions.

To conclude, the B_{pg} evaluation procedure by [2] is theoretically unjustified and could only be used as an empirical exercise. Moreover, the experimental data by [2] do not provide the accuracy claimed for the B_{pg} es-




FIG. 1: $\Delta\rho_c(B)$ by [2] (symbols) are fitted to the dependence proposed in [2], $\Delta\rho_c(B) - \Delta\rho_c(0) \propto B^\alpha$, and to $\Delta\rho_c(B) \propto \exp(-B/B_0)$, which are shown by the broken and solid lines respectively; the table shows the fitting parameters obtained.

estimate, thus rendering irrelevant their phase diagrams. Hence the conclusions of [2] lack reliable grounds beyond those of Ref.[1]. Additional inconsistencies in [2] carried over from prior articles [4] cast further doubts on the reliability of [2]. However, as far as the raw data are concerned, these may not necessarily be incorrect. In particular, the estimates of resistive upper critical field correlate reasonably with [1]. Interestingly, H_{c2} for crystals of vastly different doping [2] follow the single dependence, $H_{c2} = H_0(t^{-1} - t^{1/2})^{3/2}$ ($t = T/T_c$), with the doping dependent $H_0=4-12T$, see [5] for details.

I am grateful to Nai-Chang Yeh for drawing my attention to [2], to A. Alexandrov for stimulating discussions and to the Leverhulme Trust for financial support.

V.N.Zavaritsky

Department of Physics, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, United Kingdom.

- [1] V.N. Zavaritsky, M. Springford, A.S. Alexandrov, cond-mat/0006089; *ibid*/0011192 and references therein.
- [2] T. Shibauchi *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5763 (2001)
- [3] V.N. Zavaritsky, Physica C**404**, 440 (2004)
- [4] Thus, the assumptions of [2] drastically contradict the principal conclusion of Ref.[13] from [2], which attributed

the negative MR to the *superconducting* state and, moreover claimed $\rho(B)$ to exhibit strong current dependence up to $4-5H_{sc}$, H_{sc} is the field of $\rho(B)$ maximum.

- [5] V.N. Zavaritsky, JETP, **94**, 802 (2002)